

S. phanie Kost

**From:** The Stringham Family [stringh@mail.comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 07, 2004 6:05 AM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** BPL and Broadband Issues

RECEIVED

JUN - 3 2004

ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir,

I am license radio amateur. I have been engaged in the use of the Amateur Radio Service since 1972 at various levels of experience. I had an Amateur Extra Class license and engage my interests in minimal communications technologies. I design and build transceivers that develop signals in the same output range as Access BPL (my comments will be limited to Access BPL and my use of BPL refers only to this system). Implementation of this technology will eliminate my access to over the air experiments entirely.

I realize that it I may be spitting into the wind on this issue, but I feel that I need to ask you what I feel is a reasonable question. I would really like to know what, if any, value you place on the Amateur Radio Service and what you feel this service should be doing with the spectrum that we have been allocated? I get the distinct impression that this Commission would rather that we just fold up quietly and allow it to reallocate our spectrum to more important or valuable services.

I have limited my activities to low power minimal techniques because of interference complaints from my mother-in-law, but have discovered that this is a challenging and rewarding area of investigation that is worthy of my talents. You see I was licensed when it was required of me to send and receive plain text at 20 WPM to qualify for my present license class and I continue utilize this skill in my on air activities. I hold BS degree in Engineering Technology and have well over 30 years of experience in electronics of all types. I build circuitry for a living, but am interested in designs for my own interests.

The HF spectrum from 1.705 Mhz to well over 50 Mhz. is a unique resource that is best suited for long range communications utilizing narrow bandwidth modulation techniques. VHF and higher frequencies do not have this unique characteristic and are better suited to short range and wide bandwidth techniques and are a more suitable place for broad band communications systems.

BPL, should it fully be implemented, which I doubt, would pollute the very limited HF spectrum with carriers and digital modulation. This will render any form of narrow bandwidth communications impossible without substantial transmitter power which WILL result in interference to BPL and result in a host of complaints to the Commission and local authorities. The cost to the community, as a whole, will be enormous and chaos caused with be complete. I would really like to know how this Commission intends to handle this issue. I can not see it doing my other than to eliminate any service that causes interference to BPL. This the only option that makes any sense.

It is my position and that of the amateur community in general that broad band technologies are best implemented using spectrum that does not support long range communications. We would advocate and encourage the use of UHF and higher frequencies for this service. It would seem to me that small directional repeaters between poles would be just as economical as BPL and result in far less interference, short DSS type modulations techniques be utilized. The transmitter power levels required using this type of technique would be significantly below that used by BPL and result in very little interference to any of the allocated services. The last link from this type of system to the home could be a WiFi system. I use an 802.11b system in my home now for an LAN and it has been working flawlessly for nearly 2 years now.

I would really like to hear what this Commission feels the Amateur Radio Service should be doing with its spectrum. I look forward to hearing from you office in this regard.

Respectfully Yours,

Kenneth E. Stringham, Jr. AE1X  
13 Linden Street  
Attleboro, MA 02703  
Cell: 1-617-817-6167  
Home: 1-508-222-5386

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE

KES:kes

---

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.

Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).

Version: 6.0.672 / Virus Database: 434 - Release Date: 4/28/2004

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** KG4OHH@BellSouth.Net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 05, 2004 1:10 AM  
**To:** Undisclosed-Recipient;  
**Subject:** Broadband over Power Lines causing interference

**ORIGINAL RECEIVED**

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**Importance:** High

Broadband over Power Lines causing interference,

On April 26, There was a meeting with President Bush and the American Association of Community Colleges Annual Convention in Minneapolis: "There needs to be technical standards to make possible new broadband technologies, such as the use of high-speed communication directly over power lines. Power lines were for electricity; power lines can be used for broadband technology. So the technical standards need to be changed to encourage that.

Using power lines to distribute broadband services (called Broadband over Power Lines, or BPL), it is a bad idea that should not be encouraged. As a federally licensed Amateur Radio operator who has passed a Federal Communications Commission (FCC) examination in radio communication technology, I can tell you why.

Power lines were designed to transmit electrical energy. They were not designed to transmit broadband signals, which is fact are radio-frequency (RF) signals. When a broadband signal is put on a power line, much of the RF energy leaks off the line and radiates, causing interference to nearby radio tranreceivers. Interference has been documented at test sites throughout the country and overseas where BPL is in operation. Recordings of actual interference at several test sites are available at:

<http://www.arrl.org/bpl>

The nation's 680,000 radio amateurs are especially concerned about this interference because it affects the short waves -- a unique portion of the radio spectrum that supports long-distance, intercontinental radio communication. Licensed radio amateurs use these frequencies for hurricane reporting, disaster and emergency relief, and many other purposes in accordance with FCC regulations. The Amateur Radio Service is the only 100% failsafe emergency communications capability in the world. No matter what happens, radio amateurs Must be able to communicate with one another without having to rely on the expensive and vulnerable infrastructure -- but we cannot maintain our emergency networks if BPL is deployed and interferes with the weak radio signals we are trying to hear.

In addition to amateur operation, the short waves are used for international broadcasting, aeronautical, maritime (ship to ship or shore), and other services including the home land security, military and Aircraft Beacons Depending on the frequencies in use, BPL interference also could wipe out radio communication for many of our nation's First Responders - Police, fire, and emergency medical personnel -- who use low-band VHF radios operating in the 30-50 megahertz (MHz) range.

Radio amateurs support expanded broadband services to consumers at lower cost. Indeed, they tend to be early adopters of new technology. However, there are ways to deliver broadband that do not pollute the radio spectrum as BPL does. These include fiber-to-the-home, cable, DSL, and Broadband Wireless Access. None of these technologies causes interference to short wave radio what so ever.

BPL is sometimes touted as a solution for rural areas. It is not. A BPL signal only carries a few thousand feet down a power line and then must be repeated. This requires a lot of hardware and will not be economic in areas with low population densities.

The FCC recognizes the interference potential of BPL and is in the midst of a rulemaking proceeding, ET Docket No. 04-37, that proposes new requirements and measurement guidelines for BPL systems. However, the FCC proposals do not go nearly far enough to protect any of over-the-air radio communication services.

In short, BPL has a major disadvantage that is not shared by other broadband technologies and that outweighs whatever benefit it may offer. National broadband telecommunications policy should not include support for BPL, but should focus on other, more appropriate technologies.

By encouraging broadband over power lines, the administration is heading in the wrong direction. Please do what you can to change its course of action .

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mark & Gayle Shaw

KG4OHH, KG4QOZ  
KG4OHH@BellSouth.Net

---  
Outgoing mail is is certified Virus Free From A.V.G.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.673 / Virus Database: 435 - Release Date: 5/5/2004

0437

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

From: Jim Statham [jim@stathams.us]  
Sent: Saturday, May 01, 2004 11:31 PM  
To: Michael Powell  
Subject: BPL

ORIGINAL

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Sir,

My name is Jim Statham and I am a licensed amateur radio operator with the callsign oh KI4CWM. And I have been following the issue of Broadband Over Powerlines, and I personally think that it is a great idea. People need to be able to receive high speed internet from anywhere. But there is the problem of HF interference. In particular to the Amateur bands. Of course the ARRL has contacted you many times about this and they have also spoken to President Bush about this, and I understand that two Congressmen have also contacted you about this.

But lets step back from the interference stand point and look at it from a security standpoint. If BPL emits enough RF to cause RFI to Amateur radio operators. That it could easily skip off the ionosphere to someone with a HF receiver and decoder/decriptor and monitor what people are doing on the internet. This is a potential privacy issue that should be inquired about.

However I trust in your decisions that you and the rest of the Commissioners make.

Respectfully,

Jim Statham  
KI4CWM

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).

Version: 6.0.537 / Virus Database: 332 - Release Date: 11/6/2003

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE

Stephanie Kost

From: John Rickard [kj4ca@qwest.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2004 4:18 PM  
To: Michael Powell  
Subject: BPL

RECEIVED

ORIGINAL

JUN - 3 2004



Card for John  
Rickard (224 B)

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Powell,

As an amateur radio operator, I wish to register my objections to part of the President's recent initiative relative to the internet, specifically the Broadband over Power Line matter.

I believe you are aware of the consequences of transmitting broadband signals over the power line infrastructure, i.e., the disruption of many of the radio bands including certain "ham" bands.

I urge you to use your position and influence to block further encroachment onto our bands which have proven so invaluable in times of emergency. I recognize that the utilities are anxious to tap this potential source of revenue, but believe approval of their access will be antithetical to the general interest of radio communications.

It seems that such interference will be in violation of existing FCC regulations.

I attempted to email the President using the web site created for that purpose, using as as subject "environment". However, the web site would not accept that subject.

Your consideration of our concerns will be appreciated.

Best regards,

John R. Rickard, KJ4CA  
CO Springs, CO

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** john ayres [jitzack@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 05, 2004 4:50 PM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** The future of BPL

**ORIGINAL****RECEIVED**

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Chairman Powell,

I wanted to send a letter to you and express my concern over the use of BPL concerning the 3-30 MHZ. portion of the HF band. I am concerned that this system will jeopardize the integrity and reliability of the HF bands for the following services. Military Communication, Civil Air Patrol, Amateur Radio, Shortwave broadcast, Ship-to-Shore communication (incd. Weather Fax) and Aircraft radio. I am truly convinced that BPL will deliver "harmful interferences" to these frequencies and may render them useless. I understand that these services are depended on less than satellite and other higher frequency services however they are vital to emergency communication and life saving efforts. American is the most innovative and resourceful country on this planet we only have to look for technology that will be as effective or more effective than the current proposed BPL system.

Thank you for your time,

John T Ayres  
4561 Barclay Crescent  
Lake Worth, Florida  
33463

It you feel like discussing this more please feel free to call me at  
anytime,  
561-641-5081.

---

FREE pop-up blocking with the new MSN Toolbar - get it now!  
<http://toolbar.msn.com/go/onm00200415ave/direct/01/>

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

04-37

**Stephanie Kost**

**RECEIVED**

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** Starofseven@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 24, 2004 11:29 PM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** BPL hearings

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Please have hearings on BPL(broadcast over power lines). It will destroy all ability for emergency communications. Other countries have tried this, it is a disaster! It also raises very serious concerns for privacy.

thank you,  
L.L. Osmolinski  
Hollidaysburg, Pa. 16648

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_



EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

04-37

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

**From:** Starofseven@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 24, 2004 11:29 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** BPL hearings

JUN - 3 2004

ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Please have hearings on BPL(broadcast over pwoer lines). It will destroy all ability for emergency communications. Other countries have tried this, it is a disaster! It also raises very serious concerns for privacy.

thank you,  
L.L. Osmolinski  
Hollidaysburg,Pa. 16648

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** Steve Carr [sdcar@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 23, 2004 9:53 AM  
**To:** edward.thomas@fcc.gov  
**Cc:** Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** BPL

**ORIGINAL**

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Regarding your statements referenced in the Wall Street Journal article of 3/23/04, I'd love to give you the answer about why BPL is this "major calamity".

Let's put it in simple terms; If my amateur radio station was to spew out the kind of RF garbage that you would allow the power companies to get away with, the FCC would revoke my license, fine me and seize my property.

Why even bother to pay lip-service to the concept of spectral purity or even bother to license the use of these frequencies any more? You might as well open up the entire HF & Lower VHF spectrum to unlicensed broadcasting by the public (that's essentially what you are doing anyway). Why not just eliminate all of the amateur frequency allocations under 50MHZ - wouldn't that be a bit more honest?

The ironic part of it all is that you are willing to entirely write-off this chunk of spectrum for an inferior quality "quasi-broadband" service that simply won't have the bandwidth available to provide the level of service that people really want. Even worse, you want to pipe this crap right into my home with 50 unterminated receptacles radiating away at arms length.

Why is this thing a "Major Calamity" as you so arrogantly put it? Why do I care? Well, let's see....

It has something to do with the thousands of dollars of equipment of mine that you will instantly render useless and without residual value. It has something to do with the hundreds of man-hours spent engineering and constructing the very best installation and performance that I could afford, again rendered useless. It has something to do with the unbelievable reversal in philosophy on the part of the commission.

The FCC used to subscribe to a doctrine that services sharing a spectrum allocation were required to cause a minimum of interference to each other. It's obvious that this no longer holds true.

I'm terribly sorry - if you can't understand this after two years in your current position, I don't believe that you ever will and probably are not qualified to hold that position.

Steve Carr

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

0437

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** Matthew E McNeely [bogie1000usa@juno.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 02, 2004 10:59 AM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** BPL

**RECEIVED**

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**ORIGINAL**

Dear Mr. Powell,

Your decision on BPL deployment is totally wrong. I am a certified electronic engineer, and a amateur radio license holder. and have been following this travesty that your supporting. BPL over unshielded wires is going to cause wide spread communications problems. Any first year engineer can tell you that sending digital square waves over unshielded wire is not only going to cause broadband radio frequency noise. the fact is that this kind of radiation is also going to cause problems with any and all radio signals not just shortwave but getting into public service and emergency communications. If you think that this is going to be a way to get broadband into rural areas it's not. the cost of the equipment is going to make it prohibitive for the deployment for this service in rural areas. what is going to happen is that the electric utilities will deploy this into urban areas so they can get in on the lucrative broadband in those areas and they will end up not deploying it in rural areas because of the cost.

Stop this now before it's to late.

Sincerely,

Matthew E. McNeely

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** Martinbrossman@cs.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 02, 2004 6:36 PM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** BPL Comments and miss dating of receipt

**ORIGINAL****RECEIVED**

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

The following comments were sent on May 2 the "Date Received" notice of May 3 is incorrect. Please correct.

There is deep concern and apparently trial evidence that this action would have a detrimental impact on Ham radio. This would be a violation under rules and a great disservice to the nation. The proponents of this action are asking the FCC to promote a harmful action under which the FCC itself becomes a deliberate perpetrator. Such an action is a violation of public trust and a basis of action in the courts

Your Confirmation Number is: 200452761149  
Date Received: Mon, May 3, 2004- **THIS IS INCORRECT**  
Docket: 04-37

**DISCLOSURE**

This confirmation verifies that ECFS has received and accepted your filing. The filing you are making is a public filing. Any information that you submit will be available to the general public. Filers are encouraged to retrieve and view their filing within 24 hours of receipt of this confirmation.

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** 103324.765@compuserve.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 26, 2004 12:15 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** 'Please Do Not Allow Broad Band on power lines'

**ORIGINAL****RECEIVED**

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Commissioner Martin,

'Emergency response communications have never been more critical, or more difficult.

That''s because of a common problem on police, fire and EMS radios: interference. Interference, garbled or dropped communications, inhibits first responders from doing their jobs safely and effectively. Essentially, if first responders can't communicate, they can't help and may themselves be in danger.

Please listen to the voices of public safety. Our neighborhoods, families and fellow public safety professionals cannot afford to wait any longer. '

Sincerely,

David Hald  
2624 Traction Ave, #20  
Sacramento, California 95814

CC:  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
Representative Robert Matsui

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

0437 03/10/04

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** Doug Stephen [otterbe@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2004 1:31 AM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** BPL

**RECEIVED**

**ORIGINAL**

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Hey, Michael

I'll keep it clean!!!! BPL!!!! Are you nuts????

Doug Stephen  
Lincoln, NE

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JUN - 3 2004

0437

Stephanie Kost

From: Steve Carr [sdcar@comcast.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2004 9:53 AM  
To: edward.thomas@fcc.gov  
Cc: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Jonathan Adelstein  
Subject: BPL

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

~~03-10-04~~  
**ORIGINAL**

Regarding your statements referenced in the Wall Street Journal article of 3/23/04, I'd love to give you the answer about why BPL is this "major calamity".

Let's put it in simple terms; If my amateur radio station was to spew out the kind of RF garbage that you would allow the power companies to get away with, the FCC would revoke my license, fine me and seize my property.

Why even bother to pay lip-service to the concept of spectral purity or even bother to license the use of these frequencies any more? You might as well open up the entire HF & Lower VHF spectrum to unlicensed broadcasting by the public (that's essentially what you are doing anyway). Why not just eliminate all of the amateur frequency allocations under 50MHZ - wouldn't that be a bit more honest?

The ironic part of it all is that you are willing to entirely write-off this chunk of spectrum for an inferior quality "quasi-broadband" service that simply won't have the bandwidth available to provide the level of service that people really want. Even worse, you want to pipe this crap right into my home with 50 unterminated receptacles radiating away at arms length.

Why is this thing a "Major Calamity" as you so arrogantly put it? Why do I care? Well, let's see....

It has something to do with the thousands of dollars of equipment of mine that you will instantly render useless and without residual value. It has something to do with the hundreds of man-hours spent engineering and constructing the very best installation and performance that I could afford, again rendered useless. It has something to do with the unbelievable reversal in philosophy on the part of the commission.

The FCC used to subscribe to a doctrine that services sharing a spectrum allocation were required to cause a minimum of interference to each other. It's obvious that this no longer holds true.

I'm terribly sorry - if you can't understand this after two years in your current position, I don't believe that you ever will and probably are not qualified to hold that position.

Steve Carr

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

04-37

Stephanie Kost

JUN - 3 2004

From: Steve Carr [sdcar@comcast.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2004 9:53 AM  
To: edward.thomas@fcc.gov  
Cc: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Jonathan Adelstein  
Subject: BPL

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

*[Handwritten signature]*

ORIGINAL

Regarding your statements referenced in the Wall Street Journal article of 3/23/04, I'd love to give you the answer about why BPL is this "major calamity".

Let's put it in simple terms; If my amateur radio station was to spew out the kind of RF garbage that you would allow the power companies to get away with, the FCC would revoke my license, fine me and seize my property.

Why even bother to pay lip-service to the concept of spectral purity or even bother to license the use of these frequencies any more? You might as well open up the entire HF & Lower VHF spectrum to unlicensed broadcasting by the public (that's essentially what you are doing anyway). Why not just eliminate all of the amateur frequency allocations under 50MHZ - wouldn't that be a bit more honest?

The ironic part of it all is that you are willing to entirely write-off this chunk of spectrum for an inferior quality "quasi-broadband" service that simply won't have the bandwidth available to provide the level of service that people really want. Even worse, you want to pipe this crap right into my home with 50 unterminated receptacles radiating away at arms length.

Why is this thing a "Major Calamity" as you so arrogantly put it? Why do I care? Well, let's see....

It has something to do with the thousands of dollars of equipment of mine that you will instantly render useless and without residual value. It has something to do with the hundreds of man-hours spent engineering and constructing the very best installation and performance that I could afford, again rendered useless. It has something to do with the unbelievable reversal in philosophy on the part of the commission.

The FCC used to subscribe to a doctrine that services sharing a spectrum allocation were required to cause a minimum of interference to each other. It's obvious that this no longer holds true.

I'm terribly sorry - if you can't understand this after two years in your current position, I don't believe that you ever will and probably are not qualified to hold that position.

Steve Carr

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_



EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

04-37

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

From: Luis E. Aynat [wirelessdj@comcast.net]  
Sent: Sunday, March 21, 2004 8:26 PM  
To: Michael Powell  
Subject: 'broadband over power lines (BPL)'

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

ORIGINAL

I would like for you to propose that congress review 'broadband over power lines (BPL)' before it is enacted. The technology is a Great idea but, the interference could destroy Ham Radio , short wave, FEMA, aviation, CB radio, AM radio, fire and police radio, and possibly more communications

Think about it! you can not shield power lines so they become large antennas! Don't you have engineers to look into this?

All I feel is that we should REVIEW it before it is put into place.

[http://www.infoworld.com/article/04/01/07/HNbroadbanddog\\_1.html](http://www.infoworld.com/article/04/01/07/HNbroadbanddog_1.html)

Thank you  
Luis Aynat  
New Castle, Delaware

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**Stephanie Kost****RECEIVED**

**From:** C. Jessup [redzep@peak.org]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 21, 2004 3:15 AM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** Re: BTL

**ORIGINAL**

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Do not do this! 6 countries have better sense than destroy their communication systems. This is GREED if you allow BTL to silence our nation. I will be writing and telling everyone I know to fight your bad judgement on this issue.

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**Stephanie Kost**

**EX PARTE OR LATE FILED**

**From:** 103324.765@compuserve.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 26, 2004 12:15 PM  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** 'Please Do Not Allow Broad Band on power lines'

**ORIGINAL**

0437

**RECEIVED**

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

'Emergency response communications have never been more critical, or more difficult.

That''s because of a common problem on police, fire and EMS  
radios: interference. Interference, garbled or dropped communications, inhibits first  
responders from doing their jobs safely and effectively. Essentially, if first responders  
can''t communicate, they can''t help and may themselves be in danger.

Please listen to the voices of public safety. Our neighborhoods, families and fellow  
public safety professionals cannot afford to wait any longer.

Sincerely,

David Hald  
2624 Traction Ave, #20  
Sacramento, California 95814

cc:  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
Representative Robert Matsui

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

0437

Stephanie Kost

JUN - 3 2004

**From:** Dave Burr (AMG Teleran Corp) [dtburr@amgteleran.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 01, 2004 10:27 AM  
**To:** Michael Powell; KJMWEB  
**Subject:** BPL Provider Database

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**ORIGINAL**

Dear Sirs:

I understand that under the NPRM covering BPL, it is likely that a database will need to be established for consumers and commercial users that lists information regarding equipment locations and types.

Our company is an Application Service Provider for on-line (web-based) database applications, and we are interested in developing and operating this for the FCC. Will you please provide a recommendation as to whom to contact at the Commission regarding this proposal?

Dave Burr  
President

AMG Teleran Corporation  
820 N. Franklin St. Suite 200  
Chicago, IL 60610  
Phone: 312-640-3934  
Fax: 312-803-0017

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

**From:** Dave Burr (AMG Teleran Corp) [dtburr@amgteleran.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 01, 2004 10:13 AM  
**To:** Michael Powell; kgmweb@fcc.gov  
**Subject:** BPL Provider Database

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

ORIGINAL

Dear Sirs:

I understand that under the NPRM covering BPL, it is likely that a database will need to be established for consumers and commercial users that lists information regarding equipment locations and types.

Our company is an Application Service Provider for on-line (web-based) database applications, and we are interested in developing and operating this for the FCC. Will you please provide a recommendation as to whom to contact at the Commission regarding this proposal?

Dave Burr  
President

AMG Teleran Corporation  
820 N. Franklin St. Suite 200  
Chicago, IL 60610  
Phone: 312-640-3934  
Fax: 312-803-0017

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

0437

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

From: Dale & Jan [djnick101@sherbte.net]  
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2004 1:34 AM  
To: Michael Powell  
Subject: BPL

JUN - 3 2004

ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Powell,

I've been doing a little reading and looking into Broadband for Power Lines (BPL) and it seems to me that the FCC will have to do their part to make sure that BPL doesn't interfere with shortwave and scanners the way it does now.

While BPL would be great for rural areas, along with metro areas, for those who don't have any interest in shortwave and scanners, it would be a disaster for any of us who listen to shortwave and scanners. While I don't listen to either on a very regular basis it is very enjoyable when I do listen.

Please do whatever is in the FCC's power to make sure that if/when BPL starts being installed and used it is regulated to cause no interference with shortwave and scanners, along with regular AM radio signals. I can see nothing but static coming out of the power lines without some regulation.

sincerely,

Dale Nick  
1512 12th St No  
Princeton, MN 55371-1013  
763-633-4827 home  
763-245-9142 cell

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

04-37

Stephanie Kost

ORIGINAL

From: firstsearch@comcast.net  
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2004 10:24 AM  
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein  
Subject: Broadband over Power Lines-OPPOSED!  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

JUN - 3 2004

Importance: High

**If you morons allow this to interfere with my SHORTWAVE reception, EXPECT LITIGATION!  
VOTE NO ON BPL! ON TOP OF THAT LOOK WHAT IT DOES TO POLICE AND FIRE FREQ'S.**

Bob Clark & Kay Haenggi-Clark  
10854 NE 108th St.  
Kirkland, WA 98033  
425 827 9949

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

0437  
RECEIVED

Stephanie Kost

From: DAVID POPOWITCH [farms2@juno.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 20, 2004 9:14 PM  
To: Michael Powell  
Subject: Broadband over Power Line (BPL)

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

ORIGINAL

Dear Mr Powell,  
As a concerned citizen for the well being of the people of this country, I strongly disagree with the proposed Broadband over Power Line (BPL). Without going into all the uncontrolled risks, many citizens that you may not hear from all have the same concerns.

Please scrap this idea and utilize the current technology. There are more negatives than positives to this proposed idea.

DL Popowitch  
Akron Ohio

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_



Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

**From:** James Langford [j.c.langford@worldnet.att.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 23, 2004 4:13 PM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** Broadband Power lines

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
 Office of the Secretary

ORIGINAL

April 23, 2004

Sir:

I am a Ham Radio Operator who wants to object to the creation of the BPL almost without any publicity in this area of the country. As a former Club President, I want you to know that we were very active in the Emergency Preparedness and also Community Service groups. In the Northwest, there are often emergencies that we have volunteered to assist the community. My understanding is that BPL will be very damaging to Ham Radio because of the static interferences it causes. Let me present items for consideration.

1. In this area, the Emergency Prep Coordinator has told us that the only reliable communications has always been Ham radio. The cell phones etc have jammed in every emergency situation. This despite the State spending a lot of money to develop an emergency center expressly to avoid using Ham Radio.
2. The Ham Radio Operators are self contained personal units that buy their own equipment, repair their own equipment, keep it in good shape in case of an emergency situation, volunteer their time, equipment, and car usually at their own expense to serve the community need. Why the government deserves such a good deal or even wants to replace it is strange? They can never get a better deal---or is it the money they collect from huge commercial firms that want to take over the Ham Radio operations?
3. The FCC, I'm told, is considering stealing some of the Amateur Radio Spectrum for BPL as they have already allowed some in the past. Is this true? When will the FCC finally leave our assigned spectrum for us?
4. Ham Radio was responsible for the historic and large discoveries in the past--because they were given the freedom to operate and experiment. I thought this was a characteristic privilege for USA Hams that allowed them to excel over Hams around the world. We have certainly an outstanding record of achievements.
  - a) First contact by radio with the moon.
  - b) Radar developments (microwave oven, ranging, etc. ).
  - c) Radio Control developments for model equipment leading into automotive uses, military excellence in battle, etc.
  - d) Communications of all kinds but esp. for rescue land, and sea.
  - e) Equipment to monitor contamination, trapped personnel underground and underwater.

Actually the list goes on and on. Why would the FCC not recognize this and retain the services of one of the most prolific and patriotic units in the country--and mostly at little expense to the government. Is the tax paid by vendors worth the destruction of one of the great inventive groups to our country? I'm am mystified at the least by developments that resemble betrayal to our group.

Sincerely James C. Langford 1338 Sacramento Richland, Wash 99352 509-946-5893

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
 List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

From: john robert burger [jrb@csun.edu]  
Sent: Thursday, April 22, 2004 5:03 PM  
To: Michael Powell; k1zz@arrl.org  
Subject: BPL

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

ORIGINAL

ET Docket No. 03-104  
ET Docket No. 04-37

These comments are being send to the top mainly because it is unclear who is compiling this important information.

It is interesting that citizens may employ RF transmissions over power lines as they see fit, legally under existing Part 15 rules. Aging high voltage power lines with extreme interference to licenced radio today would not stop higher power wire transmissions, especially those of a broadband nature. Of course, power line interference is difficult to locate, and practically impossible to stop, as we all know, so it is unlikely anyone would ever complain.

Robert Burger  
Professor  
CSUN

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

04-37

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

Stephanie Kost

ORIGINAL

JUN - 3 2004

**From:** kerry [kerry@northnet.org]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 24, 2004 4:55 PM  
**To:** Michael Powell; Jonathan Adelstein  
**Cc:** Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Fw: The Line is Drawn ... by Whom?

Federal Communications Commission  
 Office of the Secretary

Dear FCC Commissioners, I am forwarding this to you hoping that you will read it and check into this matter further. I am involved in Emergency Communications in New York as a RACES Radio Officer, an ARRL Emergency Coordinator, and District coordinator for three counties in the state. I am concerned that our rights and our much needed radio communications assisting federal and local government is in jeopardy. I hope you will keep this great free volunteer service that these served agencies need in mind where BPL is concerned.....thank you

Kerry I Bickford

76 Rte. 27 Ext.

Oswegatchie, NY. 13670

Amateur Call - WA2NAN

**Sent:** Saturday, April 24, 2004 8:42 AM

**Subject:** The Line is Drawn ... by Whom?

==>UTILITY DRAWS "LINE IN THE SAND" ON BPL INTERFERENCE ABATEMENT

In an e-mail this week to the FCC, an electric utility testing broadband over power line (BPL) systems in the Raleigh, North Carolina, area has drawn a virtual line in the sand on how far it plans to go to mitigate interference to Amateur Radio. Responding this week to the FCC about BPL interference complaints from hams, Progress Energy Corp (PEC) told the FCC that his company has eliminated any harmful interference from its BPL trial site and now complies with FCC rules.

"It is PEC's position and interpretation of the FCC's rules with regard to 'harmful interference' that any interference that may still exist is not 'harmful' as that term is defined by the FCC's rules," Len Anthony, PEC's attorney for regulatory affairs, told James Burtle, chief of the FCC's Experimental License Branch. "This level of interference does not seriously degrade ham radio operation or transmissions or cause repeated interruptions." Some, but not all, of PEC's BPL field trials are covered by an FCC Part 5 experimental license.

The FCC defines as "harmful" any interference that "seriously degrades, obstructs or repeatedly interrupts a radiocommunication service operating in accordance with the Radio Regulations."

Anthony claimed that since PEC can modify its Amperion BPL system to totally eliminate interference to fixed stations, "the only impact of any kind upon ham operations is upon mobile operators." PEC concluded that since BPL interference to mobiles would be "very short lived," the company is not causing harmful interference and is in "full compliance" with FCC Part 15 rules.

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
 List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

ARRL North Carolina Public Information Officer Gary Pearce, KN4AQ, suggests PEC has a bit more work to do. He is among local amateurs closely monitoring BPL deployment in the test zones and cooperating with PEC and Ameripon to work out any interference issues. Pearce says interference remains on the top end of 20 meters in an overhead-line field trial neighborhood where PEC recently had tweaked its system.

"Nothing had changed," he told ARRL after visiting the neighborhood in the wake of Anthony's e-mail. "They were still covering up the top end of the 20-meter band." Interference to 17 and 12 meters had been notched out, but beyond that, BPL interference persisted from 14.290 to nearly 17 MHz, he said, and "fringe" carriers still encroached some 100 kHz into the bottom of 15 meters. Interference had not been mitigated at all in neighborhoods with underground power service, he said.

Progress Energy has been operating its "Phase II" trial in three neighborhoods south of Raleigh since early January. The area, in Wake County, is largely rural or lightly settled.

No hams live in the underground-wired neighborhood, so none complained, Pearce said. The handful of BPL interference complaints eventually lodged with the FCC came from amateurs living closer to the overhead-wired neighborhood, and some were from mobile operators.

Pearce said PEC's stance regarding mobile stations "sets a new bar" in interpreting harmful interference. "Hams have never been asked to accept that level of interference before," he said, noting that mobiles driving by a power line can hear the signal for "a mile or so."

The ARRL's BPL strategy calls for the League to seek a radiated emission limit sufficient to protect the estimated 70,000 Amateur Radio mobile stations in the US. ARRL field observations using typical amateur equipment have documented BPL interference to mobile stations located hundreds of meters from BPL interference sources.

Pearce says the North Carolina hams will respond to Progress Energy and the FCC to disagree with its interpretation of "harmful interference" and its conclusion regarding interference to mobiles.

While he maintains that controlling BPL in a small trial area like his should not be that difficult, "having BPL buzzing across all the power lines in a large city is another story entirely, and that's what we're worried about."

ARRL CEO David Sumner framed the situation another way. "If BPL emissions block weak signals that otherwise would be usable, that is harmful interference and they must remedy it," he said. "Progress Energy has as much as admitted that they can't. The only thing left for them to do is to shut their system down and get back to their basic business of supplying electrical energy."

Additional information about BPL and Amateur Radio is on the ARRL Web site  
<<http://www.arrl.org/bpl/>>.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED 0437

**Stephanie Kost**

**From:** Ricky Bryce [ricky@brycefamil.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 16, 2004 9:34 AM  
**To:** Michael Powell  
**Subject:** BPL

**RECEIVED**

**ORIGINAL**

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you out of concern of Broadband over Power Lines.



From the information I have read, BPL is going to be a major safety issue for our community. Our area relies on radio (police, fire, and amateur operators) for civil defense. It sounds like the FCC is willing to allow big money corporations to wipe out this method of communication for us without regard to the consequences. Can you assure us that BPL will not be permitted if interference (even in the slightest amount) occurs anywhere in the radio spectrum?

Thanks,

Ricky Bryce

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**Stephanie Kost**

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

04-37

**From:** Xoxo092878@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, April 19, 2004 8:29 PM  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Cc:** julissa.sabates@diageo.com  
**Subject:** Access BPL - Proposed Rule Docket # 03-104

**ORIGINAL**

**RECEIVED**

JUN - 3 2004

**Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

Dear Mr. Copps;

I am writing to you on behalf of a group of students from Florida International University. We are doing research on the proposed rule on Access BPL (Docket # 03-104) and would really appreciate it if you could answer the following questions to help us with our research:

Should the FCC limit BPL use to 50 MHz to avoid interference to licensed radio services? This has been suggested by proponents of BPL such as United Power Line Council (UPLC).

Will radiated measurements on Access BPL systems be carried out before the FCC moves forward with this proceeding?

How will this new technology affect HAM radios that have in the past been an essential source of communication in times of national disasters such as 911?

What additional measures to Part 15 are needed to protect particular operations, such as public safety. For example, should the FCC require that BPL system coordinate with public safety agencies that use the HF band for state-wide public safety communications?

Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Julissa Sabates  
Florida International University

Tel: 1.305.269.4510  
Fax: 1.305.269.4503

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Stephanie Kost

From: Richard Battles [battles.richard@mail.lee.k12.al.us]  
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 3:59 PM  
To: Commissioner Adelstein  
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

RECEIVED

JUN - 3 2004

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

ORIGINAL

Richard Battles (battles.richard@mail.lee.k12.al.us) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

Please do not allow BPL to destroy the HF spectrum. The HF spectrum is used by me and many others to listen to stations from Europe, South America, and even the United States on shortwave.

BPL is not sound technology. Only Fiber-optic systems, GHz wireless systems, and Satellite systems will work without destroy the resource of HF.

There will be not future on HF with BPL.  
Amateur Radio will be destroyed as well.

Please review the technical implications of BPL. Power lines are antennas not balanced transmission lines. They will radiate the HF spectrum that BPL will use. Please stop this madness. Protect the HF radio spectrum.

Thank you  
Richard Battles

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 204.29.106.14  
Remote IP address: 204.29.106.14

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_